



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,288	02/23/2004	Edward A. Verdugo	GDEAV01C	2287
33076	7590	11/02/2004	EXAMINER	
GEOFFREY E. DOBBIN, PATENT ATTORNEY 4278 SOUTH 6220 WEST WEST VALLEY CITY, UT 84128-6501			JOHNSON, STEPHEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3641	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/708,288

Applicant(s)

VERDUGO, EDWARD A.

Examiner

Stephen M. Johnson

Art Unit

3641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/23/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 4, how is the phrase "one set" intended to relate to the previously claimed "at least one set of guide dots"? In claim 1, line 5, the phrase "the center" lacks an antecedent. In claim 1, line 6, the phrase "the incomplete area" lacks an antecedent. In claim 7, line 1, the phrase "the outer aiming ring" lacks an antecedent.

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because: it is not signed and dated by the inventor.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 4-7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Afshari.

Afshari discloses a reticule comprising:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) a central aiming ring; | 102 |
| b) an incomplete area at the bottom; | 134 |
| c) at least one set of guide dots; | 141-145; 125-129 |
| d) a central aiming dot; | 143, 127 |

- | | |
|---|--|
| e) extension of the dots through the incomplete area; | see fig. 2B |
| f) extending in a linear fashion; | see fig. 2A, 3, or 4 |
| g) at least one ranging system; and | col. 6, lines 10-26;
col. 9, lines 47-63 |
| h) illumination means. | (same means) col. 5, lines 65 – col. 6, line 3
(same means) col. 8, lines 21-37 |

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Afshari in view of Wascher et al..

Afshari applies as previously recited. However, undisclosed are dots of different sizes with larger dots being positioned near the center of the reticule. Wascher et al. teach dots of different sizes with larger dots being positioned near the center of the reticule (see figs. 15A and 15C). Applicant is substituting one shaped sighting dot for another in an analogous art setting. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Wascher et al. to the Afshari reticule and have a reticule with differently shaped sighting dots.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Afshari in view of Smith (537).

Afshari applies as previously recited. However, undisclosed are dots whose spacing is

largest distant the central aiming dot. Smith (537) teaches dots whose spacing is largest distant the central aiming dot (see fig. 4B). Applicant is substituting one spacing arrangement of aiming dots for another in an analogous art setting. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Smith (537) to the Afshari reticule and have a reticule with a different arrangement (spacing) of aiming dots.

8. Claims 8 and 11-14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Thomas et al., Allen, Hayward, Austin, Marble, Beutler, and Kraus disclose other state of the art reticules.


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Johnson whose telephone number is 703-306-4158. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 703-306-4198. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-4177.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9326. The fax phone number for after final communications is (703) 872-9327.

Application/Control Number: 10/708,288

Page 5

Art Unit: 3641



STEPHEN M. JOHNSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Stephen M. Johnson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3641

SMJ